

gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) has certainly been a leader. I thank him for providing continuous leadership in education, not only in the State of North Carolina and this Nation, but now providing it here in the U.S. Congress.

As the gentleman speaks about education, the infrastructure that leads to the future, many of our schools in Edgecombe County, in fact two of them, will not be able to be used perhaps the rest of this year because they have been seriously damaged by the flood.

The infrastructure I hope that we were talking about improving our school under the modernization act will now need to be looked at in terms of FEMA providing some monies for that.

But, Mr. Speaker, I hope that, as we have opportunity to look at eastern North Carolina, that we put education as one of the infrastructure that, not only we bring back to the status quo before the flood, but that we try to improve those facilities so that the young people in eastern North Carolina, not only can survive this storm, but be prepared for the 21st Century, and that they can have the kind of facility that allows them to prepare for that future.

Also, the infrastructure has been greatly disadvantaged throughout eastern North Carolina. Some estimate that just the electricity alone will cost more than \$80 million. The water system has not yet been assessed.

So schools and other infrastructure that have been damaged by the storm need to be restored. But in education, we do not just need to restore it, we need to improve the facility.

So the gentleman is absolutely right for the bills that he had that would have improved the school must go forward, not only for people in eastern North Carolina, but for this Nation, because we need to find a way where we make sure that the equal divide, the equal opportunity that levels the playing field for the future is actual education. So we have to find for the facilities for that.

I just say educational facilities have been greatly damaged by the flood. Many of our schools have been damaged. But I know several of our schools in two counties we will not be able to restore them. I understand FEMA will come back and try to perhaps restore them. But think about the other schools that need that kind of opportunity to improve.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) is absolutely right. As we think of this whole issue of digital divide she was just talking about, the information technology is really the largest job creating engine in the history of the world. To leave a group of people behind is unacceptable, unforgivable, and criminal when we have within our power the ability to do something about it.

We can provide the facility to put it in. We can work together to make sure

every child has access to the technology. When we think about currently almost 70 percent do not have access in some ways in this digital divide, that is unacceptable as we approach the 21st Century.

The richest nation in the history of the world, we must do more, we can do more. This is inexcusable that we do not do more. I think, as a Congress, we have an obligation to make sure that we leave no one behind as we approach the 21st Century.

We need to provide scholarship for science and math and greater support for technology training. Our greatest challenge is to take educational excellence, not just into the suburbs, but to every inner city, into the rural areas as well. We need to improve education for all children in all parts of America.

We need to encourage our people to be more demanding of their government leaders so that we can get the job done. Industry needs to push harder. Not enough pressure is being put, in my opinion, in the right places to get it done.

Finally, let me conclude by saying that this Congress still has the opportunity to do something great for America's future, and we need to do it this year.

MIAMI RIVER CLEANUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, for the first time, we have been able to obtain Federal assistance for a long sought dream, the cleanup of the Miami River.

□ 1930

This was included in the Fiscal Year 2000 Energy Water Appropriations bill which Congress has just passed. This is a major victory in preserving a key part of our environment, as well as allowing the Miami River to become a major contributor to international trade and economic growth. This is the beginning of a 4-year phase dredging project proposed by the Miami River Commission with the assistance of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

It provides a \$5 million initial appropriations to begin maintenance dredging of the river, which eventually will cost \$64 million from Federal, State and local sources.

This cleanup will eliminate a significant pollution threat to Biscayne Bay, which used to be one of the Nation's most pristine environments. It will also ensure the continued growth of the Miami River as one of our Nation's critical shipping links to the Caribbean and to South America.

Thanks to the tremendous bipartisan teamwork of the South Florida Congressional Delegation and a broad-based coalition of community leaders, decision interests, and officials at the

Federal, State and local levels, we have been able to achieve this goal, which is vitally important for both the future of our growing trade with our neighbors to the south and the Caribbean, as well as preserving a waterway which is a key part of our ecosystem.

We thank on behalf of the South Florida Congressional Delegation all of our colleagues this week for passing the bill in the House, for passing the bill in the Senate. It is on the President's desk, and we hope that he signs it soon to make this dream a reality for all of South Florida.

EDUCATION, THE ARTS, AND NATURAL RESOURCES IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, this evening I want to talk about a number of different subjects. I was not going to talk about education until I heard some of the previous comments, and I think it is important to clarify some of those comments that were made and talk about the direction that the Republican party is going in regards to education. Those remarks will be somewhat brief.

I then want to cover the topic that we have seen with the Brooklyn Museum in New York City. I am going to move from that subject to a subject that I think will be very uplifting to all of my colleagues, and that is the Third Congressional District of Colorado.

We are going to talk about natural resources, as we can see with this picture I have behind me. That is what that district looks like. We are going to get into much more detail about that, cover the water issues, cover the Federal land management issues, and so on. So I think it is going to be a very interesting hour. I look forward to the participation of my colleagues.

But let me begin, first of all, by talking about the preceding comments. First of all, it is important that our friends and our colleagues on both sides of the aisle from North Carolina understand that everybody across this country, 49 States across this country, are going to pitch in for that one State that got hit as devastating as North Carolina.

North Carolina, you are not alone. You are in the United States; and in the United States of America, we are a team and we stick together and we help the other States when the other States are in need of help.

I would expect the other States to help me in Colorado if we had some sort of a disaster. That is why we are the United States of America. So the preceding speaker who spoke on North Carolina, bless her. I understand the tragedies that she is going through. I do not live there, but we are willing to

help make it right. Everybody in this chamber is willing to help make it right for North Carolina.

But let me talk just for a moment about the kind of disaster aid. And when we do this, we must be careful. We still have a fiduciary responsibility to the people who have elected us to make sure that that money gets to the people that need it. We have a fiduciary responsibility to minimize, if not eliminate, Government waste.

So if we ask for accountability on these disaster funds, do not come back at us and say, my gosh, you do not care about the poor people who have suffered these tragedies. You know, that often happens in government business. The minute you question a program for accountability, for efficiency, to see whether or not you have got waste, to see whether or not those dollars are going to the people that need the dollars or the people for whom the dollars were intended, the minute you question it, all of a sudden you are cold and heartless and you do not care about these people that are in these tragic situations.

We have an obligation to make sure that money goes where it is needed and where it is going to do the most good. So do not be upset or offended if we ask some pretty tough questions about how these dollars are being spent.

Which leads me into education. It is amazing to me that the Democrats can stand up here on this House floor and say that they are the only ones for education and that this side is anti-education.

How many people, think of it, how many people have you ever run into that will tell you they are against education? You do not run into people that are against education. Education is a critical mass for the success of this country. It is absolutely essentially for the future of this country. It is what gave many of us in this country a base from which to operate because we learned something because the generations ahead of us taught us and made sure we had good schools. We on the Republican side and the Democrat side feel an obligation to make sure that education is the best.

Well, let me tell my colleagues, there are some things we need to do in the classroom. And some people disagree with that. But on the Republican side, we feel we have to put discipline back in the classroom. And if you do not believe me, take a look at what the disciplinary problems were 20 years ago and take a look at what they are today and take a look at the difference in discipline allowed to the school teacher who has a very difficult job, take a look at the discipline he or she is allowed to exercise in her classroom compared to the discipline that he or she was allowed 20 years ago.

I can tell you, when I was in the 7th grade, I got in a fight on the school ground. It meant an automatic swat on the butt with a board. I remember that to this day. Now, I cannot tell you I did

not get in any more fights, but I sure did not get in any more fights on school grounds. Because we had some discipline in the classroom. The Republicans feel that is an important issue, and we do not think that you are anti-education if you say let us give the teachers the tools they need to have discipline in the classroom.

I urge the Democrats to join with us. Frankly, some of the conservative Democrats do. There is nothing wrong with telling our young people, you must behave, there are certain behavioral standards that you have to live up to; and if you do not live up to these standards, there are consequences, there is punishment, because our primary purpose is to educate you to the highest degree possible.

A second point we should make about some of the previous comments early in this last hour. You know, you do not make schools better by just necessarily throwing more money at all. What happens around here the minute you question a budget for education, the minute you stand up and question are we wasting the money, is the money producing results, is the money accounted for, is the money getting down to the classroom and not being spent in the administration, is it really going to the classroom, the minute you ask those questions, and primarily those questions are asked by Republicans, the Democrats primarily rush right up and put a label on you "anti-education."

You know what, we can make a better educational system in this country if we demand accountability, if we see where those dollars are going and make sure they are being spent efficiently, if we allow those dollars to get into the classroom. That is how we are going to make a difference in education.

I think it is very important that we also recognize that there are alternatives to public education. Now, I am not against public education. I have three children. My youngest child, Andrea, is a senior in high school. My son Dax is a junior at Colorado State University. And my daughter Tessa is a junior at Bryant College in Providence, Rhode Island. My point is this: All three of Lori's, my wife, and my children, all three of those children went to public schools.

Now, they had the option to go to private school, but we were very confident in our local public schools and in the schools that they went to throughout their schooling career. But the point is we should not take away from the people who want to home-school.

I want to say to my Democrat colleagues who were criticizing the Republicans, it was your side of the aisle just a few short years ago that went out and said, if you are a home-schooler, you should have to be licensed in every subject you teach. In other words, a father or a mother who wants to stay home and home-school their children would have to be licensed or certified in math or science or physical education. Whatever they

taught that child, they had to be certified. What did that mean? It meant the elimination of home-schooling. That is exactly what it meant.

I am saying to my colleagues on the Democratic side, come work with us in a bipartisan fashion. Do not just think that public education is the only way to go. Obviously, it is the most significant mode of education in this country. And, obviously, we need to make it as good as we can. And, obviously, it is going to cost us a lot of dollars.

On the other hand, I think I can use the word "obviously" in most cases, home-schooling is doing a darn good job. Look at the test results. Obviously, asking for accountability of these dollars that are being spent in the classroom should be done. I do not know one Democrat or one Republican who does not look for accountability or efficiency or ask for a balance in their own checkbook.

We all have a fiduciary duty to the citizens, whether they vote or not, of this country to be prudent in our fiscal decisions, to be prudent in how we spend the taxpayer dollars, to be prudent that when we spend those dollars we get the biggest bang for our dollars, to be prudent that when we spend those dollars that these kids are getting an education off those dollars. There is no question on either side of the aisle, no question that education right now is the highest priority in this country. And rightfully it should be.

But do not discount a commitment by a Republican education because they stand up and say, hey, track for me or trace for me where these dollars are going. We want the biggest bang.

Let me move on to another subject and tell my colleagues where I am extremely disappointed, extremely disappointed, in a particular aspect of the arts community in this country. I want you to know at the very onset here, I am a supporter of the arts. I think arts are very important in our community.

Now, I know some people, some of my good friends, disagree with me, but I think it is very important and I think there are certain arts programs that the Government has an obligation to be involved in. But if you want to know what gives a black eye to the arts, it is when you use taxpayer dollars to offend the public in such a way you know it is not just an offense, it is a horrible offense to them.

What am I talking about? Let us lay out the facts right here of the New York City Brooklyn Museum, a museum which has benefactors of great wealth. This museum gets government dollars from the City of New York and, as I understand it, government dollars from the Federal Government. What do they choose to do with a portion of those dollars? They are opening tomorrow a show which has a portrait of the Virgin Mary with dung, and where I come from, in the mountain country, we call it crap, thrown right on the face of the portrait of the Virgin Mary. And they call that art.

Well, let me say this to you: What they are trying to do right now, the prima donnas on that board of directors of that Brooklyn Museum, what they are trying to say to the American people or frame this argument as is an issue of First Amendment rights, the freedom of speech.

In this country, we believe very firmly in the right for freedom of speech and in the First Amendment of our Constitution. We believe very strongly in that amendment. What are they trying to say? They are saying, that, well, our opportunity to use taxpayer dollars to pay for a display, a portrait of the Virgin Mary, to throw crap on it, that is our right to express First Amendment rights.

□ 1945

Let me say, this is not to be framed as a first amendment argument. It is not a first amendment argument. Those of us who are opposed, and obviously I am deeply opposed to what they are doing, but those of us who are opposed to this are saying, Look, you have a right to display that kind of art, but you do not have a right, we have to draw a limitation somewhere, you do not have a right to do it with taxpayer dollars. Nobody is taking away your right of freedom of expression under the first amendment. You can go downtown and show that, you can carry a picture of it in your wallet, you can carry it on the subway, you can carry it on horseback out in the mountains if you want to show people. Nobody is denying that you have the right to do that. But you do not have the right to take taxpayer dollars to display a portrait of the Virgin Mary with crap thrown all over it.

I wonder what the reaction would be of these liberal prima donnas if somebody put up a portrait of Martin Luther King and threw crap on it. They would do something. Of course it would be horribly offensive. Would they be standing up today saying, well, it is the first amendment, we in the Brooklyn museum ought to display something like that?

I wonder what these prima donnas would say if with public dollars, taxpayer dollars, we got a Nazi swastika and put it in a park for public display? I wonder what these prima donnas would say if somebody got an AIDS quilt, those beautiful quilts made in memory of the people who have died as a result of AIDS, I wonder what they would think if they hung an AIDS quilt and somebody threw crap on it?

It is wrong. You know it is wrong. You should not be using taxpayer dollars for this display. So what do they do? It is not in them. It is not in them to stand up to the American public and say, you know, we were wrong. We made a mistake. This portrait of the Virgin Mary with crap splashed all over it should not be displayed with taxpayer dollars. But they do not do it. They are not going to do it. So what happens? We as publicly elected offi-

cials and specifically a publicly elected mayor in the city of New York, Mayor Giuliani, steps forward and says, you are not going to use taxpayer dollars for that kind of display. That is off-limits. You went across the line. He did not say you could not display it anywhere. He did not put a ban on the portrait. He just said with taxpayer dollars in this tax-paying institution, you are not going to display the portrait of the Virgin Mary with crap splashed all over it.

So what happens? Well, the liberal community, the prima donnas, they decide this is where we are going to draw a line in the sand. Today it is a Catholic symbol. Tomorrow they will go after a Jewish symbol. Where do we draw the limit with taxpayer dollars? When do we say enough is enough? You have got to use some common sense.

Today I was on a radio talk program. It was pretty interesting. I had the commentator say to me, "SCOTT, how can you tell what's offensive or not?" I said, "What do you mean how can I tell what's offensive? Common sense ought to tell you." You think a Nazi swastika in a public park is offensive? The most reasonable man concept, and I say that generically obviously, your common sense, your gut reaction, your gut tells you, that is offensive. We should not have taxpayer dollars doing that. That is not a violation of the Constitution. It is not a violation of the Constitution at all. We say to TV broadcasters, you cannot show certain things on TV. That is not a violation of the first amendment. It is taxpayer dollars.

My point that I am making here is that it is important for all of us to understand that it is really pretty easy to decide what is obscene art and what is not. What the Brooklyn museum could have done and should have done is to call one of their private benefactors, many of whom are very wealthy, and ask them to put up the private dollars to display this somewhere, fund it with private dollars. By the way, anybody that funds this kind of display is sick in my opinion and do not get me wrong. I do not think this is acceptable in any form of the word. But constitutionally it is permitted. But not with taxpayer dollars. This Brooklyn museum should have gone to those benefactors and said, put up private dollars, not the taxpayer dollars, private dollars and display it with private dollars.

What happens? All of a sudden the politics get involved. Hillary Clinton, First Lady, steps in, she is running for the United States Senate. Well, she says, this museum ought to be entitled to do this. She has taken the side of the museum. There is a pretty clear difference right there between what the mayor of New York City is saying, no taxpayer dollars, and this display is deeply offensive, and what the Senate candidate over there is saying. It is common sense.

Can you imagine our forefathers, the generations of the people who fought in wars for us, or the Catholics in this

country, and, as I said, it may be the Buddhists next, it may be the Jews next, it may be some other group next, can you imagine our fathers and mothers, our grandmothers and grandfathers, the Founding Fathers of this country, what they would have done if they saw that today, under the guise of the Constitution, we were paying with taxpayer dollars to display a portrait of the Virgin Mary with crap splashed on it? Of course you know what your gut reaction tells you that those people would say. They would not believe it. They would be stunned. They could not believe that this great country did not have the restraint with taxpayer dollars to say, Enough is enough. We have certain standards in this country and one of those standards is we are not going to use taxpayer dollars to put a Nazi swastika in a park, we are not going to use taxpayer dollars to destroy or insult the Virgin Mary, which is a huge Christian symbol, by throwing crap all over it, we are not going to display a portrait of Martin Luther King and throw crap all over it, we are not going to display an AIDS quilt and throw crap over it. We have standards in this country. And it is not asking too much to say out there, "Don't do it."

How does it affect the Third District of the State of Colorado out where I live, out where I represent? Because of the attitude of these prima donnas on the board of directors of the Brooklyn museum in New York City, it puts a black eye on the arts clear across this country. Do you know how many of my constituents are going to say to me, "SCOTT, if we're putting an art display in Colorado somewhere, is it going to be this kind of display? Is it going to be taxpayer dollars?" I am begging these people on the board of directors of the Brooklyn museum, look what you are doing to the art industry across this country, in the little communities of Colorado or the little communities of Utah or up in Washington State or down in Nevada or in North Dakota or in Wyoming, or Kansas or Texas. Do you think this story is isolated in New York City? Of course it is not isolated in New York City. It is all over the country. And here we have so-called patrons of the arts standing up and saying we are justified under the Constitution to display a portrait of the Virgin Mary with taxpayer dollars and have crap thrown on it. It is wrong. You are hurting everybody in the art business, in the art profession.

I know I am going to get a bunch of angry phone calls this evening, people opposed. I went to law school. I have got experience with this. The Constitution does not protect the right for you to use taxpayer dollars and have that kind of display. I hope for the sake of everybody, because it is really a losing deal. You may get a lot more people to your show, Brooklyn museum, and maybe you are doing this for the money, but in the long run it is the arts that suffer. It is the very community that you profess to protect. It is

□ 2000

the very community that you profess to stand up for. It is the very community that probably in your heart you feel very deeply about. It is that community, the art community, that you are helping destroy through this kind of action in New York City with your display of the Virgin Mary with crap thrown all over it. You ought to grow up, and you ought to get one of your private benefactors and pay for it with private dollars. It is a disgrace. More than anything else, you in your heart know it is a disgrace. You in your heart know, and mark my word for it, the next time either this evening before you go to bed or tomorrow when you wake up and you look in that mirror, you look in that mirror and say, it is art, to do this to a portrait of the Virgin Mary with the taxpayers' dollars.

Let us move on to another subject. Obviously after the last couple of comments, I want to lighten it a little. I want to talk about the natural resources, kind of the layout of the United States. In order to do that, I need to give a little description of where I live and the district that I represent. I am very proud of my district. I think every Member in here, both Democrat and Republican, obviously are proud of their districts. My family has lived in this district, they were pioneers in the mid to late 1800s, and through all the generations we have been there.

I will tell you a little story. When I went to law school, my wife and I wanted our oldest daughter born in Colorado. I went to law school in Texas. We felt so strongly about our heritage in Colorado, she stayed behind to deliver our baby, so that she was born in Colorado. So we feel strongly about that.

I will give you an idea of the Third Congressional District of Colorado. It is geographically larger than the State of Florida. Looking to my left, here is this portrait. That is what most of my district looks like. It is beautiful, mountainous terrain and these mountains you see up here, we have in Colorado over 56 mountains above 14,000 feet. I would guess that this peak right here, with the red dot on it, is probably above 14,000 feet. What is interesting is a lot of these mountains have snow year round. In fact, I am sure many of you saw, and of course we are big Bronco fans, but I am sure many of you saw last week that in Denver, it snowed in Denver. Very interesting geographical locations and lots of beauty obviously up in these mountains. You can see these trees right here, we call those Aspen trees, they are in my opinion some of the most beautiful trees, certainly in my district and probably in the entire world.

Now, a lot of this land that we have, by the way, let me show you the blue sky. I am going to do a little promotion here about Colorado. That blue sky right there in Colorado, we have over 300 days a year of sunshine, 300

days a year of sunshine in the State of Colorado. My district takes up a little more than half of the State of Colorado. But one of the things you have got to remember about the West is water. That is a pretty boring subject, water. It is real boring unless all of a sudden it is not coming out of your faucet, or it is not there to flush the toilet or they do not have it to serve you in the restaurant. Water is a critical resource obviously. By the way, it is the only resource that regenerates itself. It is the only natural resource, I guess the better way would be to say that it has got automatic renewal, it automatically renews itself.

Here are some interesting statistics. Ninety-seven percent of the water in this country is saltwater. Of the remaining 3 percent of water in this country, 75 percent of that is tied up in the ice caps. Actually only .05 percent of that water is in our lakes and our river for drinking and consumption by humans. When you break that out, 73 percent, and I know I am throwing a lot of statistics out to you but just kind of picture it as we go along. Picture the United States, a map, imagine the United States, a map in front of you. Imagine a line going down between Kansas and Missouri. Seventy-three percent of the water in this country is east of that line. About 13 percent, actually 12.7 percent, around there, about 13 percent, we will round off, 13 percent on our imaginary map right here is up in the Pacific Northwest. And 14 percent is located, almost 15 percent, is located in what we call the mountainous west. That is 14 States. Those 14 States have one-half of the continental nation's land mass. Half of the land mass in this country, in the continental States is located in 14 States, and those 14 States have 14 percent of the water. Water is a critical resource.

In the East, one of the problems in the East is getting rid of water. Remember, 73 percent of the water lies east of the Kansas-Missouri line, so your problem out in the East, if you live in the East, in a lot of aspects is how you drain off the water, how do you get rid of the water. Our problem in the West is how do we save the water.

Of those 14 States that I talked about, Colorado is at the top of those 14 States. Colorado has been called the mother of rivers. Colorado has four major rivers which originate out of those mountains and they originate, of course, as the result of the snowfall. So all of that snow that you see throughout those mountain ranges, and this of course is a small fraction, the red dot on the picture, that snow is what provides the water for those four rivers. That is why Colorado has the title, The Mother of Rivers. It has got the Colorado River, the Rio Grande River, the Platte River, and the Arkansas River.

As I mentioned earlier, in the West we have got to have the capability to store our water.

You see, we do not have heavy rains like in Washington, D.C. I never experienced the kind of rains that you have back here. I mean when it rains here, it rains and rains and rains.

Now we get evening rains in the mountains a lot, but we do not have a lot of quantity of rain. So what happens, because of that we are called an arid State. We do not get a lot of water, we do not accumulate a lot of rain. I think in Colorado our average water is 16 inches a year.

So where we focus on the water is the snow in the mountains. Now how do we get the snow on the mountains converted into the water, and how do we get ahold of it? Well, it is a natural process, you all know it. It happens in the spring; it is called spring run off. Melts the snow down for a period of time.

Now we have problems with spring run off. If it gets too warm too early in the spring, then the water runs off before we are able to use it for agricultural purposes because we are not quite ready yet. If we do not get the snow accumulation, then we have a drought year. If it stays too cold, then the rain, although the water comes down, it can be too late especially in regards to agriculture.

So we are very dependent upon the weather out there, but once this run off contains, that run off goes for about, oh, 60 to 90 days; 60 to 90 days in the spring is when we get the run off from those mountains. So for 60 to 90 days we literally have all of the water we could possibly want. But after that 90 days, what do we have to do with that water? We have to store the water.

Now I know that some of my colleagues get kind of a charge out of criticizing dams and water storage in the west. I want many of my friends in the east to understand we are different than you are back here as far as water conditions are concerned. In the east you have got to get rid of it. In the west we have got to preserve it.

If we did not have dams, and by the way the first dam was not in the Roosevelt era, it was clear back in about 1000 AD in Mesa Verde. It is when the cliff dwellers out in Mesa Verde, which is near Cortez, near the four corners, and the four corners are where four States come together in one spot; it is where the cliff dwellers were; again, a thousand AD. The thought is by the historical studies that the reason the cliff dwellers disappeared from the Mesa Verde dwellings is because they had a drought and their dam did not store enough water. That is how serious water is in the west and that is why we have to have dams.

So, before you buy onto some of these people who condemn dams or water storage, understand in the west just how critical it is, and in Colorado we have an interesting situation. In Colorado one half of the State, the western half, the part I represent, the Third Congressional District, produces

80 percent of the water, but 80 percent of the population lives on the other side of the State. So you can even see that even at the State level within our own State boundaries water is a very, very important subject, and there are a lot of things we can talk about, but I think some statistics on water and how important water in our life is important for us to look at.

An acre foot of water. A lot of times you hear people talk about an acre foot of water. An acre foot of water is about 326,000 gallons of water, to be exact 325,900 gallons of water. Traditionally it has been considered enough water for a family of four people, a family of four people for 1 year. One acre foot of water is enough for a family of four for 1 year. But now that we have brought in some very helpful conservation efforts, we have expanded that. Now I think in today's language one acre foot of water, or 325,000 gallons of water, is enough really to extend a family of four for 2 years. Conservation has paid off, but we have to use conservation in the right fashion.

Now just talk for a minute about how much water is needed; for example, for a cow. A steer drinks 4.2 gallons of water a day. If you are going to have milk, the jersey cow that produces the milk needs 12 gallons of water a day. For a holstein producing a lot of milk it is 23 gallons of water a day. An acre of corn, one acre of corn, gives off 4000 gallons of water per day just in evaporation. So an acre of corn, 4000 gallons of water evaporate off that acre a day. To grow one bushel of wheat you need 11,000 gallons of water. One bushel of wheat; can you imagine, one bushel of wheat, 11,000 gallons of water. You need 135,000 gallons of water to grow one ton of alfalfa. Thank goodness that resource is an automatic renewal.

These are numbers you probably never heard of before. They are numbers that surprise me, and I spent half my professional career in water.

About 1,400 gallons of water are used to produce a meal of a quarter-pound hamburger, an order of fries and a soft drink. So when you go to the store and you get a quarter pounder and order fries and a soft drink, to grow that, to get everything ready for it, took 1,400 gallons of water.

About 48,000 gallons of water, 48,000 gallons of water are necessary to produce the typical American thanksgiving dinner for 8 people. So those of you who are going to have thanksgiving dinner at your house and you have got 8 people, keep in mind that about 48,000 gallons of water were necessary to produce everything at that dinner table.

About 1800 gallons of water are needed to produce the cotton in one pair of jeans, 1,800 gallons of water for one pair of jeans. Four hundred gallons just to produce the cotton in a shirt; 400 gallons for your shirt.

Takes 39,000 gallons of water to produce the average domestic automobile including tires. Listen to that:

39,000 gallons of water to produce the average domestic automobile.

So you can see that water plays obviously a very important part in our lives, and I know that recently there has been a lot of criticism about water and about our water management in the west, and a lot of this criticism comes from special interest groups frankly in the east. So I want to say to the average person out there: Before you join on with some of these people that criticize us, understand our differences.

Now one thing we all have in common when it comes to water is we all use, for example, an acre foot of water every year for a family of four whether you live in New York City or whether you live in Denver. So we have a lot of things in common with the water, with the use of water. But the retention of water is different in those western States than it is in the east.

Now a couple of other things that I thought that I would point out about water that are important:

One of the fun things to think about of course are the physical characteristics that I told you about the State of Colorado, and as I mentioned, in the State of Colorado about half of our State has most of the water, 80 percent of the water, and the other half of the State has 80 percent of the population. It requires a lot of cooperation between those two geographical areas of the State of Colorado, but we have been able to do it for many, many years, and we intend to continue to be able to do that.

What I hope to do is come back again. I have given a lot of statistics this evening on water, and I am going to come back to this House floor to talk to my colleagues to address this water, but I am going to do it in a series of speeches because you can take in too much in one evening, or I can put out too much. I guess you can take all you can handle, but I can put out too much in one evening about water.

I just want you to leave this evening thinking about water is a automatically renewable resource. There is a difference in water retention in the east versus the west. Most of the water lies in the east, 73 percent of the water lies east of the Kansas-Missouri line. Only 14 percent of the water lies in half the land mass of the United States; those are the western States. Ninety-seven percent of the water is salt water. Only 3 percent is the kind clear water, and of that 3 percent, 75 percent of that 3 percent, so 75 percent of the 3 percent is tied up in the ice polar caps. So you can see for all the water we have in the world, only a small small fraction of that water is actually good for consumption.

Let me move very quickly, and then I intend to turn over the remainder of my time to a colleague of mine who would like to make some comments on another subject. I want to talk to you about something that happened very exciting this last week here on the House floor.

Now we have all heard several discussions in the last few days about all kinds of subjects, but one of the things that happened on a bipartisan basis out of this House of Representatives is for the first time in 85 years we have a new national park in the State of Colorado. It is called the Black Canyon National Park. We passed it out of the House. Senator BEN CAMPBELL was the sponsor in the Senate, I was the sponsor in the House. We passed it out. I fully expect the President to sign it, and I think within the next month the Black Canyon National, what I am calling now National Park was a national monument in Gunnison, Colorado, will be a thing of reality. It is spectacular, it is incredible, and I hope that you have an opportunity to go to Montrose, Colorado, and visit the Black Canyon National Park.

This is a picture right here. Notice my red dot. These are sheer walls, and the Black Canyon, by the way, it is the color of these walls which have very black rock on them; that is where the Black Canyon got its name. Clear at the very top here, right up there where the red dot is in the right hand corner of that picture, those are trees up there. So a human being would actually be about a fourth the size of that red dot. Look at the sheerness of this cliff.

Those cliffs, and that gorge and that canyon, as we go down through here, are as high as 2,000 feet, 2,000 feet. These are some of the oldest rocks known to mankind, and what is neat about this project is a lot of people came together to make it happen. This was not a mandate by the Federal Congress, it was not an outside-of-the-area group that came in and said you do not know how to take care of this country, we are going to come in here and make this a national park. It was local people who cared about their local community who felt the responsibility to their local people, to the State people and to the people of the United States to do something to allow people to really see and understand the magnitude and the magnificence of the Black Canyon in the State of Colorado.

Now I want to thank publicly here the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the majority leader who helped us get it on the floor. I want to thank the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the House Committee on Resources. I want to thank the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) who was the House subcommittee chairman on national parks, and Tod Hull. He is a legislative staff on the public lands. I like to also thank Cindy Bowen; she is a county commissioner out in Montrose, Colorado; Sheridan Steele. Sheridan is the Superintendent of the Black Canyon, and they are very proud out there about what has happened. I want to thank Siobhan McGill, Floor Assistant, Office of the Majority Leader; Ken Gale who is the interim director of the Montrose Economic Development, and Ken has been back here

numerous times. This is a pet project for Ken. Ken, congratulations; you got a lot to be proud of. I want to thank Steve Aquafresca, the former State representative out of the State of Colorado representing that area. I want to thank Wayne Keith, and I want to thank the currently-elected officials that represent that area, Kaye Alexander, Jim Dyer and many of the other elected local officials and so on, the communities of Crawford, Paonia, Montrose, Olathe, Cedar Ridge, Hotchkiss, Delta; the counties, Club 20. There are a lot of people, the staff members of the BLM, Dave Roberts, the Forest Service. They all pitched in to help us show off to all of you the spectacular beauty of the Black Canyon National Park.

Now amongst all of those walls right there, and here you can see the river up close. Now let me tell my colleagues, our water, water sports in Colorado on the hottest day of the summer will still make your teeth chitter, but there is a lot of excitement in seeing this kind of water, pure water. It is said to be so pure; look at the second picture here; that you can stand up on some of these cliffs, obviously not at 2,000 feet, but you can stand up on some of these cliffs and actually spot trout in the clear water in the pools down below.

This is also the home for habitat of bears, bobcats, all kinds of animal species. It is beautiful, and you should take that opportunity to come out and see Colorado.

□ 2015

One more quick picture before it falls. Look at the walls here again. Two thousand feet, you can see the walls here. There is a tree right there where the red dot is, straight down.

Let me wrap up my remarks by telling you, of course, all throughout our country the fall is a beautiful season, the colors, the smell, the blue sky. But if you have an opportunity, come out and enjoy our State.

Finally, as my final remarks, let me reemphasize my remarks at the beginning of my discussion with you this evening, and that is to our friends, our family, to people we do not know in the state of North Carolina: The other 49 states of this country will not abandon you. The other 49 states of this country will be there to help you through the tragedy that you recently suffered. I know that it may seem remote at this time, that kind of help, but there are prayers from all across the country coming your direction. There are resources, including monetary resources and everything from generators to lanterns to batteries to fresh water, resources from all across this country, coming to help you out.

Again, North Carolina, you will not be forgotten.

WHITE HOUSE APPEASING CASTRO REGIME

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYES). Under the Speaker's an-

nounced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 15 minutes as the designee of the Majority Leader.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say I just got back from Colorado Springs a couple of weeks ago, and what the gentleman said about Colorado is absolutely true. It is a gorgeous state.

Mr. Speaker, once again I underestimated the lengths to which the White House would go to appease the Castro regime, the most violent sponsor of terrorism in the Western Hemisphere.

If you think freeing over one dozen FALN terrorists responsible for the deaths of his own countrymen is unexplainable, what the White House is doing right now is baffling.

Mr. Speaker, today I am disturbed by reports that as the White House was preparing to grant clemency to 16 imprisoned terrorists, it told the State Department to grant a visa to a notorious Cuban spy named Fernando Garcia Bielsa. This visa would allow Mr. Bielsa to work under diplomatic cover at the Cuban Interests Section just blocks from the White House.

Ironically, Mr. Bielsa is a high-ranking Cuban communist party official in charge of supporting the very terrorist groups to which the prisoners belonged. President Clinton is asking the State Department to issue a visa to Bielsa, in spite of the evidence in intelligence reports linking him with the FALN terrorists and other terrorist groups.

I was particularly impressed by reports that the FBI strongly objected to granting a visa to him. Yet, apparently when the State Department pressured the FBI, the Bureau had to drop its objections.

It has been reported that Mr. Bielsa serves as the chief of the American Department of the Cuban Communist Party Central Committee. The American Department, known by its initials DA, has a long tradition of being Castro's main instrument for coordinating terrorism in the Western Hemisphere, including agent influence activity and support for Puerto Rican terrorism against the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the State Department continues to classify Cuba as a state sponsor of international terrorism. In fact, the State Department's report, Patterns of Terrorism Report for 1998, Cuba reportedly maintains, "close ties to other state sponsors of terrorism and leftist insurgent groups in Latin America. For instance, Columbia's two main terrorist groups, the FARC and the ELN, maintain representatives in Cuba. Moreover, Havana continues to provide a safe haven to a number of international terrorists and U.S. terrorist fugitives."

Make no mistake about it: Cuba believes what the FALN stands for and has a history of supporting them in very material ways. Senate hearings in 1982 revealed that Cuban intelligence helped organize the FALN terrorists and other related groups. Here are a few examples.

Cuba continues to provide asylum to FALN terrorist fugitives, including William Morales, who escaped in 1979 while serving a 99 year sentence for bombing and murder. He fled to Mexico, where he fled a policeman and was finally granted asylum by the Castro government.

Just last year, in 1998, Mr. Bielsa flew to Puerto Rico to meet with leaders of a Puerto Rican terrorist group. What I want to know is why did not the Clinton Administration automatically refuse Mr. Bielsa's visa application? Under U.S. law, the State Department cannot independently issue visas to foreigners believed to be entering the country for the purpose of hostile intelligence activity.

A 1981 State Department report says the DA was created to "centralize Cuban control over covert activities" in support of revolutionary groups in our hemisphere. Who pressured the State Department to grant this visa for Mr. Bielsa? Was it the National Security Council? If so, who pressured the NSC?

Mr. Speaker, Castro has spies here in the U.S. For example, last year 10 people allegedly operating as a spy ring for Castro were arrested and accused of collecting information on U.S. military installations and anti-Castro groups in Florida. At the same time, the arrests ended the most extensive espionage effort involving Cuban agents ever uncovered in the U.S.

U.S. Attorney Thomas Scott was quoted as saying, "In scope and in depth, it is really unparalleled in recent years. This was an attempt to strike at the very heart of our national security system."

Investigators said it was the first time in memory that a Cuba-sponsored spy ring had been dismantled in Southern Florida, even though between 200 and 300 operatives are believed to have worked with impunity in the Miami area for decades.

Our intelligence has uncovered new construction and an expansion of a Russian spy base near Havana that could endanger U.S. military operations overseas. The number of satellite dishes has doubled from three to six. Workers built new buildings, new parking lots and a swimming pool for the Russian military technicians who are now running the base. From this facility, Moscow has intercepted communications from the White House, the State Department, Washington-based international financial institutions and private U.S. companies.

In fact, the Russians had intercepted advanced word on U.S. military movements during the 1991 Persian Gulf War. And, Mr. Speaker, if that doesn't frighten the American people, China's defense minister visited Havana last year to negotiate the construction of an electronic spy base next to this Russian facility. This is not fiction from a paperback novel, Mr. Speaker.

So it is obvious why U.S. counterintelligence believes that the Castro